



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Azure Institute
Intellectual Property Department
4108 Sorrento Valley Boulevard
San Diego, CA 92124

COPY MAILED

JUL 07 2008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application	:	
Huiyan Guo et al.	:	
Application No. 10/717,082	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: November 19, 2003	:	
Attorney Docket No. E-006U	:	

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed May 16, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the Restriction Requirement mailed May 30, 2007 which set a shortened statutory period for reply of one (1) month or thirty (30) days (whichever is later). No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on July 1, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on January 7, 2008.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an election, (2) the petition fee of \$770, and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he/she is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he/she acts.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that

such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

The application file does not indicate a change of address has been filed in this case, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. A change of address should be filed in this case in accordance with MPEP 601.03. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this application will be mailed solely to the address of record.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. *See In re Application of S.*, 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988). Since the \$525 extension of time fee submitted with the petition on May 16, 2008 was subsequent to the maximum extendable period for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be credited to petitioner's deposit account.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Kimberly Inabinet at (571) 272-4618.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 1797 for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the reply received May 16, 2008.



Carl Friedman
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: Fred C. Hernandez
5355 Mira Sorrento Place
Suite 600
San Diego, CA 92121